

REMARKS

Claims 2-8 are currently pending in the application. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 have been amended by moving the word “to” (Claim 2, line 3; Claim 3, line 3; Claim 5, line 3; claim 6, line 3; Claim 7, line 5) for the purpose of correcting an informality. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised by this amendment. Entry of the amendment, and reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the remarks below is requested.

The claimed invention can best be appreciated by, for example, contrasting Figure 2 with Figure 6 of the patent application. Figure 2 shows an example of a WWW document, while Figure 6 shows the same document as Figure 2, but also includes an embedded template provided by the retrieval screen generating portion 330 (Figure 7 shows another example without embedding). As explained on page 8 of the application at lines 19-21, “In case that an original document is insufficient in information, a user who has received such a retrieval screen can retrieve information similar to this document by only inputting its objective keywords in the retrieval screen.

Claims 2-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6, 424,980 to Iizuka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse on the basis that Claims 2-8 are not anticipated by Iizuka et al. because the claims require features which are not found in Iizuka. Moreover, Iizuka operates on a different principle than the claimed invention and requires features that are not required by Claims 2-8.

Each of independent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 require data monitoring and content judging, a retrieval screen generating means for generating a retrieval screen for a user to perform a retrieval operation taking the inferred field as an object of retrieval and outputting the retrieval screen as data to be displayed together with said retrieved document (see Figures 6 and 7 of the application discussed above), and the document retrieved is a structured document. Claim 2 contrasts from claim 3 in that claim 2 requires embedding as shown, for example, in Figure 6 while claim 3 requires the retrieval screen to be separate from the document as shown, for example, in Figure 7. Claim 5 requires the content judging means to use a specified criterion of judgment. Claim 6 requires notification from the data monitoring and content judging means to the retrieval screen generating means. Claim 7 is a Bauregard style claim.

Simply put, Iizuka does not show or suggest anything like the claimed invention. For example, no Figure in Iizuka looks anything like Figures 6 and 7 of the present application. The Examiner has suggested that column 15, lines 1-12 of Iizuka relate to “outputting the retrieval screen as data to be displayed together with said retrieved document; however, this suggestion is simply incorrect. This passage of Iizuka refers to the process methodology of Figure 8 of Iizuka and pertains to providing the user with a search result having proper user output domains. In the Iizuka process identified by the Examiner there is a determination made as to whether the user output domain and local domain of each item agree with each other. Thus, Iizuka is not “generating a retrieval screen for a user to perform a retrieval operation” on an “inferred field” and displaying the retrieval screen with a retrieved document. Moreover, the Examiner has highlighted column 15, lines 15-33 of Iizuka as pertaining to generating a retrieval screen for a user to perform a retrieval operation taking the inferred field as an object of retrieval. This is also incorrect. This passage of Iizuka pertains to Figures 9a-b and 10a-b of Iizuka, and it can be seen from an examination of this passage and those figures that what is being highlighted is a different presentation of cost information by two different for the same items being carried by the two shops.

In short, the main features recited in the independent claims are simply absent from Iizuka and the rejection should now be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the first embodiment of Iizuka et al. (Iizuka et al., column 12, line 44 – column 21, line 6 and Figures 5-16) requires the use of meta data, which is not required by Claims 2-8. Thus, element 15 of Figure 5 of Iizuka et al. (cited in the Office Action at 2) is identified as an “HTML document meta data storing unit,” while the remaining figures describing the first embodiment of Iizuka et al. present details of what is represented in Figure 5. (*See, e.g.*, Iizuka et al., column 13, lines 22-25) While the Examiner does not discuss the second embodiment of Iizuka et al. (Iizuka et al., column 21, line 7 – column 29, line 62 and Figures 17-38), the use of meta data is similarly taught as essential to the second embodiment of the reference. (Iizuka et al., Figure 17, element 150)

The third embodiment of Iizuka et al. (Iizuka et al., column 29, line 63 – column 35, line 41 and Figures 39-53), which is relied on in conjunction with the first embodiment to reject Claims 5 and 6 of the claimed invention (Office Action at 3-4),

employs templates without meta data (Iizuka et al., element 1345, Figure 39) unless the third embodiment is “combined with arrangements of the first and second embodiments.” (Iizuka et al., column 30, lines 7-13) In any case, the Examiner does not rely on the third embodiment of Iizuka et al. as the sole basis for rejecting Claims 5-6 but also relies on the first embodiment of Iizuka et al., which includes the requirement of meta data as discussed above.

The claims of Iizuka et al. all require either meta data or data about the location of search engines. Independent Claims 1, 15, and 17 of Iizuka et al. claim a scheme “for retrieving data contained in a plurality of semi-structured documents” (Iizuka et al., Claim 1, lines 43-44; *see also* Claim 15, lines 68-69; Claim 17, lines 23-24) requiring, *inter alia*, use of “meta data.” (Iizuka et al., Claim 1, line 46; *see also* Claim 15, line 61; Claim 17, line 25) Independent Claims 8 and 16 of Iizuka et al. claim a scheme “for retrieving data through search engines” (Claim 8, line 11; *see also* Claim 16; line 34) requiring, *inter alia*, use of “data about the location of each search engine.” (Claim 8, lines 14-15; *see also* Claim 16, lines 36-37) The other claims of Iizuka et al. are dependent claims which necessarily have the requirements of the base claims from which they depend.

In contrast to Iizuka et al., Claims 2-8 do not require the use of meta data or data about the location of search engines.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that Claims 2-8 allowed, and that the application be passed to issue. Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of

fees for the petition or for entry of this amendment to Attorney's Deposit Account
No. 50-2041 (Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson P.C.).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Whitham', is written over the printed name.

Michael E. Whitham

Registration No.32,635

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA, 22190
Customer Number 30743
Phone: (703) 787-9400
Fax: (703) 787-7557